

**Remarks**

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended. Claims 11 and 13 have been canceled. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, and 15–20 were withdrawn by the Examiner as being drawn to nonelected species.

The Examiner objected to claim 11 as being dependent on rejected base claim 1, but indicated he would allow the claim if it were rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 11 and is now in condition for allowance. The amendment overcomes the Examiner's rejections of claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bonnet (US 5,921,378) and under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson et al. (US 6,044,956) in view of Bonnet and his rejection of claims 2, 5, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonnet in view of Wood (US 6,799,672) or WIPO document WO02/024557 A1. Under 37 CFR §1.141, uncancel dependent species claims 2–10 and 12 should likewise be allowable, including those previously withdrawn by the Examiner, in view of their dependence from allowable generic claim 1.

The Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson et al. (US 6,044,956) in view of Bonnet. Claim 14 has been amended to recite that the local controller is located with its associated transport element to ride with the transport element along the lateral slot. Neither Henson et al. nor Bonnet, alone or in combination, recites all the limitations of claim 14, including a local controller that rides with a transport element along the slot. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn and independent claim 14 allowed. Under 37

CFR §1.141, dependent species claims 15-20, previously withdrawn by the Examiner, should likewise be allowable in view of their dependence from allowable generic claim 14.

In view of these remarks, claims 1-10, 12, and 14-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments and early allowance of the application.

If the Examiner thinks a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

This amendment is being sent within three months of the Office Action so no extension of time petition fee should be due. No new claims are being added so no extra claim fee should be due. If, however, fees are considered due, authorization to charge any extra claim fee or any other fees associated with this response to Deposit Account No. 12-0090 is hereby given.

Respectfully submitted,  
Robert S. Lapeyre et al.

Date: June 8, 2005

By: James T. Cronvich  
James T. Cronvich  
Reg. No. 33163  
Laitram, L.L.C.  
220 Laitram Lane  
Harahan, LA 70123  
Telephone: (504) 733-6739, ext. 1243  
Fax: (504) 734-5233